

2

the supervisor before asking review from the Director and filing a petition and or appeal. Regardless of the rejection or possible allowance of the amended figure, the feature of the invention of the rigid entity is disclosed and the claims including reference to more than one attachable container should be treated as reduced to practice or duplication of the invention or as originally claimed by the limitation "at least one attachable container" as it would be impossible to show every different configuration of attachable container and hitched container. The examiner has requested a proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings. It is not clear whether this request pertains to the Fig 1 rejected amendment, or the original Fig. 1 or the expanding or contracting container volume (error corrected by change to 'system volume'). Applicant believes all features of the invention are shown in both figures but is finding it difficult to claim or show the rigid entity novelty. Applicant is not ignoring the examiners request , nor wishes to abandon the application but requires an answer to the above mentioned fax.

Under 35 U.S.C. 112 Specification, the second paragraph states "the specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. Applicant's specification concludes with claim 1 "at least one attachable container", claim 2 "a plurality of attachable containers stacked and secured on top of said attachable container", and claim 11 "at least one attachable container, and a means for securing adjoining said wheeled container to said attachable container whereby the combined containers form a single rigid entity". These claims are the conclusion of the specification and with the attached drawing of the provisional patent and the original Fig 1 disclose the invention to enable someone skilled in the art to make and use the same. Under U.S.C. 113 are "The applicant shall furnish a drawing where necessary for the understanding of the subject matter" and in this case not even the original Fig. 1 or the provisional patent drawing or the amended Fig 1 drawings are necessary and the ammended Fig 1 drawing in any way adds new matter that was not part of the original disclosure.

not
already
addressed

Applicant again asks and waits for answer to the following previously sent fax as well as to these U.S.C. 112 and 113 positions:

In response to the PAPER NO. 17 Office Action mailed 11/05/2002, concerning claim 2 and the combining into claim 1 new matter. Applicant has sent with the RCE a drawing of wheeled container with two attachable containers, one attachable container secured to the top of the first attachable container. This drawing is page 6 of 14 of the provisional patent filed on 06/08/2000 application no. 60/209,964 as pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 119(e)(i) priority claimed in the Patent Application Transmittal Letter, and is identical in concept and structure to the amended fig. 1, showing one wheeled container and two attachable containers. This drawing of the provisional patent should positively confirm that the art is not new matter to this application and that a wheeled container with two attachable containers stacked on top of the wheeled container is the art reduced to practice as of 06/08/2000. The original fig. 1 illustrated the forming of the rigid entity (also mentioned in claim 11) for rolling in the tilted position showing the simplest configuration of the invention. The forming of the rigid entity has been the subject matter of the elected specie and is addressed by the claim language in claim 1 and is considered the object of the invention and elected specie. Claim 11 states "at least one attachable container, and a means for securing adjoining said wheeled container to said attachable container whereby

n. 11